

AIRPRO DIAGNOSTICS, LLC
v.
DREW TECHNOLOGIES, INC., et al.

EXHIBIT I
TO COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND



Via Email and FedEx
AirPro Diagnostics
Attn: Lonnie Margol

RE: Response to your email regarding AirPro License

Dear Mr. Margol,

We have evaluated your proposal to resolve the licensing issues we stated in our August 25 letter. We carefully evaluated and discussed this matter from all sides, but the fundamental issue here does not have a solution. In documents made public as a result of the Ford motion for summary judgment, and AirPro's responses, it is clear that AirPro representatives have reviewed our March 2020 letter setting forth the reasons why AirPro was violating the terms of our license. AirPro has informed us that you disagree with the accepted definition of OE scanning and do not intend to comply with the terms of our license. Your response to the motion for summary judgment amplifies that AirPro's position with respect to OEM is entirely inconsistent with ours.

We find this troublesome for many reasons, and we cannot support any use of our product where it is represented as OEM or OEM equivalent, especially in the determination of vehicle safety. In addition, it is clear that your use of our products does not comply with our license and we do not have plans to support a multi-user version of Giotto.

We regret that this situation could not be avoided.

Opus IVS, Inc.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "B. Herron".

Brian Herron